

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 00249 292326Z

73/46

ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

/026 W

----- 119741

P R 251745Z JUL 75

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2662

INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 249

C O R R E C T E D COPY (FOR ADDITION OF CITE NBR, SALT TWO-692)

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: HIGHLIGHTS: POST-MEETING DISCUSSIONS, JULY 25, 1975

(SALT TWO- 692)

1. ARTICLE XVII.3. SHCHUKIN (TO MAY/HENKIN, A-914), IN RESPONSE TO MAY'S QUESTION, REPLIED THAT IN HIS VIEW THERE WAS "NO DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DELIBERATE MEASURES TO IMPEDE AND DELIBERATE PRACTICES WHICH IMPEDE, BUT ADDED THAT "PRACTICES" ( HE USED THE FRENCH EXPRESSION "MANIERES DE TRAVAUX" WHICH IS A LITERAL TRANSLATION OF THE RUSSIAN WORDS "PORYADOR RABOT" WHICH IN TURN IS THE OFFICIAL TRANSLATION OF THE AMERICAN WORD "PRACTICES") HAD THE CONNOTATION HOW THE WORK WAS DONE. "MEASURES," ON THE OTHER HAND, REFERRED TO SPECIAL OR SUPPLEMENTARY STEPS TAKEN FOR THE PURPOSE OF HIDING NORMAL ACTIVITIES. HE GAVE TWO EXAMPLES, WHICH HE HAD GIVEN BEFORE, TO ILLUSTRATE THE DIFFERENCES. BUILDING SILOS IN THE FOREST WITHOUT MAKING ANY MORE OF A CLEARING AROUND THEM THAN NECESSARY TO BUILD THEM SHOULD BE PERMITTED WHILE COVERING THE SILOS WITH BRANCHES SHOULD BE FORBIDDEN. WORKING DAY AND NIGHT, GOOD WEATHER AND BAD SHOULD

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 00249 292326Z

BE PERMITTED WHILE WORKING ONLY AT NIGHT SHOULD NOT. WHILE

THESE EXAMPLES WERE NOT NEW, SHCHUKIN FOR THE FIRST TIME MADE IT CLEAR THAT THE FORMER ACTIVITIES IN BOTH CASES WERE ASSOCIATED IN HIS MIND WITH THE WORD "PRACTICES," WHILE THE LATTER WERE ASSOCIATED WITH THE WORDS "DELIBERATE CONCEALMENT MEASURES." HE EMPHASIZED THAT WHAT SHOULD BE FORBIDDEN ARE "MAN MADE OBSTACLES" TO VERIFICATION OR MEASURES TAKEN SPECIFICALLY FOR THE PURPOSE OF IMPEDING VERIFICATION BY NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS.

2. SHCHUKIN BROUGHT UP PARAGRAPH 2 OF ARTICLE XVII (THE LANGUAGE OF WHICH HAS ALREADY BEEN AGREED TO IN THE JDT). HE SAID IN HIS VIEW, "INTERFERENCE" MEANT ELECTRONIC INTERFERENCE. MAY AGREED THAT ELECTRONIC INTERFERENCE WAS INCLUDED IN THE MEANING OF THE WORD "INTERFERENCE" BUT POINTED OUT THAT THE DESTRUCTION OF NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS, FOR INSTANCE, WAS ALSO INCLUDED. SHCHUKIN AGREED THAT THE DESTRUCTION WAS FORBIDDEN BUT REITERATED THAT THE WORD INTERFERENCE REFERRED ONLY TO INTERFERENCE BY ELECTROMAGNETIC WAVES. HE COULD NOT EXPLAIN UNDER WHAT CLAUSE DESTRUCTION WAS FORBIDDEN. MAY STATED THAT HE BELIEVED THE AMERICAN UNDERSTANDING OF THE WORD "INTERFERENCE" INCLUDED ALL ACTIVE FORMS OF INTERFERENCE WITH THE MEANS OF VERIFICATION, AS CONTRASTED WITH THE MEASURES PROVIDED AGAINST IN PARAGRAPH 3, WHICH HAD TO DO WITH WHAT WAS BEING OBSERVED. SHCHUKIN LAUGHED AND WONDERED THAT SUCH A DIFFERENCE IN INTERPRETATION HAD EXISTED DESPITE THE "THOUSANDS OF WORDS" THAT HAD BEEN EXPENDED ON THE PARAGRAPHS.

3. RETURNING TO THE QUESTION OF THE DATE IN THE SECOND SENTENCE OF THE PRESENT U.S. VERSION OF PARAGRAPH 3 OF ARTICLE XVII, SHCHUKIN WONDERED ABOUT THE U.S. MOTIVES FOR USING THE INTERIM AGREEMENT DATE IN DEFINING THE PRACTICES TO BE EXEMPTED FROM CHANGE. HE SAID THIS WOULD ENTAIL THE NEED FOR RECONSTRUCTING THE PRACTICES THAT HAD BEEN INSTITUTED SINCE 1972 IN THE CASE OF SUCH THINGS AS BOMBERS. MAY NOTED THAT THE SECOND SENTENCE CONSTITUTED AN EXCEPTION FROM THE OBLIGATIONS TO BE UNDERTAKEN UNDER THE FIRST SENTENCE OF THE PARAGRAPH. SHCHUKIN WOULD REMEMBER THAT THE U.S. HAD NOT WANTED EXCEPTIONS TO BE MADE AT ALL. EVEN NOW, IN MAY'S OPINION, THE U.S. WOULD BE WILLING TO DO WITHOUT THE SECOND SENTENCE SO THAT THE PARAGRAPH IN QUESTION WOULD SIMPLY IMPOSE AN OBLIGATION NOT TO IMPEDE ON BOTH PARTIES.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SALT T 00249 292326Z

4. SHCHUKIN ASKED WHETHER THERE WERE PRESENT SOVIET PRACTICES WHICH THE U.S. WISHED TO HAVE FORBIDDEN. DID MAY BELIEVE THAT THERE WERE VIOLATIONS OF THE EXISTING TREATIES OR OF THE CLAUSES OF THE NEW AGREEMENT? MAY ANSWERED THAT, AS TO EXISTING TREATIES, HE COULD SAY, WITH PRESIDENT FORD, THAT THERE WERE NO VIOLATIONS. AS TO THE NEW AGREEMENT, SINCE IT HAD NOT COME INTO FORCE, THERE COULD BE NO VIOLATION. SHCHUKIN ASKED

WHETHER NEVERTHELESS CERTAIN CURRENT PRACTICES, HAVING TO DO PERHAPS WITH BOMBERS OR WITH MIRVS, WOULD BE VIOLATIONS OF THE NEW AGREEMENT IF IT WERE NOW IN FORCE. MAY WAS NONCOMMITTAL.

5. SHCHUKIN WENT ON TO SAY THAT IT WAS, IN HIS VIEW, NOT NECESSARY TO MAKE SOME SPECIAL SECLARATION BEYOND THE WORDS IN THE SOVIET DRAFT. HE THEN SAID THAT AT THIS POINT MAY MIGHT WELL ASK HIM WHAT HE, SHCHUKIN, WOULD GIVE IN EXCHANGE FOR THE U.S. ACCEPTING THE PRESENT WORDING OF ARTICLE XVII. MAY SAID THAT VERIFICATION WAS SOMETHING WHICH SHOULD BE AGREED TO IN SUBSTANCE BETWEEN THE TWO SIDES.

6. DEFINITIONS. TRUSOV (TO ROWNY, A-913), ASKED ROWNY TO DEFINE WHAT WE MEANT BY A FRACTIONAL ORBITAL SYSTEM. ROWNY SAID IT WAS AN OBJECT IN AN ORBITAL CONDITION FOR LESS THAN A COMPLETE REVOLUTION. ROWNY ASKED TURSOV IF HE HAD ANY QUARREL WITH BANNING FRACTIONAL ORBITAL SYSTEMS UNDER THE SOVIET PROVISION. TURSOV DID NOT ANSWER DIRECTLY BUT ROWNY GATHERED TRUSOV SAW NO OBJECTION. TRUSOV SAID IT WAS HIS UNDERSTANDING THAT AMBASSADOR JOHNSON HAD SHOWN EXTREME PESSIMISM OVER THE PROGRESS WHICH COULD BE MADE BY OUR GROUP. FURTHER THAT SINCE JOHNSON RESTRICTED OUR CHARTER TO THE MIRV DEFINITION, IT WOULD NOT BE PROFITABLE FOR US TO RESUME OUR MEETINGS. ROWNY SAID THAT THERE CONTINUED TO BE SOME LACK OF MEETING OF THE MINDS SINCE AMBASSADOR JOHNSON WAS SIMPLY MAKING IT CLEAR THAT WE COULD EXPECT NO FUNDAMENTAL CHANGES IN OUR APPROACH TO THE MATTER OF DEFINITIONS. ROWNY SAID HE FELT THERE WERE A NUMBER OF IMPORTANT MATTERS THAT COULD BE CLEARED UP BY THE DEFINITIONS WORKING GROUP.

7. TRUSOV SAID HE WOULD BE INTERESTED IN KNOWING WHAT QUESTIONS ROWNY HAD ON THEIR DEFINITIONS. ROWNY SAID THAT ONE IMPORTANT  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 04 SALT T 00249 292326Z

QUESTION WAS WHETHER OR NOT THEIR MIRV DEFINITION EXCLUDED MRVS. TRUSOV ANSWERED THAT HE WAS ON RECORD FROM PREVIOUS DEFINITIONS GROUP MEETINGS THAT MRVS WERE EXCLUDED. TRUSOV SAID HE WOULD PAY ESPECIAL ATTENTION TO THE MRV QUESTION IN HIS STATEMENT ON TUESDAY. JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** Z  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** POLICIES, SALT (ARMS CONTROL), ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS, DIPLOMATIC DISCUSSIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 25 JUL 1975  
**Decaption Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Decaption Note:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** GarlanWA  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1975SALTT00249  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** X1  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** D750261-0901  
**From:** SALT TALKS  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1975/newtext/t19750721/aaaaassd.tel  
**Line Count:** 159  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Office:** ACTION SS  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** EXDIS  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** GarlanWA  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 15 JUL 2003  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** WITHDRAWN <16 JUN 2003 by CunninFX, REFER TO DOD/OSD>; RELEASED <15 JUL 2003 by GarlanWA>; APPROVED <15 JUL 2003 by GarlanWA>  
**Review Markings:**

Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
06 JUL 2006

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** HIGHLIGHTS: POST-MEETING DISCUSSIONS, JULY 25, 1975 (SALT TWO- 692)  
**TAGS:** PARM, US, UR  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006